

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

<b>MOHAMMED KHALIL GHALI,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Petitioner,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>No. 3:10-CV-1751-M (BF)</b>
	)	
<b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Respondent.</b>	)	

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION**  
**OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**


The District Court referred this matter to the United States Magistrate Judge for Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation. Petitioner Mohammed Khalil Ghali has filed a Motion for Return of Seized Property (doc. 1). The Court held a hearing January 26, 2011. After consideration of all evidence presented at the hearing, the Court finds the following:

- the 1999 Ford Expedition, 1998 Lincoln Navigator, and rare coin collection were administratively forfeited and sold at auction in accordance with proper procedures;
- the \$160,000 in United States currency and the \$23,000 check issued by Metro Wholesale were administratively forfeited and deposited into the United States Treasury Forfeiture Fund in accordance with proper procedures;
- the assorted medication strips, baby formula, and over the counter medication were seized by the Texas Department of Health;
- there is no evidence that the ten camera phones were seized by the United States government; and
- there is no evidence that Petitioner's Texas driver's license, United States citizenship papers, United States passport, Jordanian passport, or Texas identification card were seized by the United States government.

Accordingly, the Court finds that the United States government does not possess the items

sought to be returned by Petitioner. The Court recommends that Petitioner's Motion for Return of Seized Property (doc. 1) be DENIED.

SO RECOMMENDED, January 27, 2011.



---

PAUL D. STICKNEY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE AND**  
**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL/OBJECT**

The United States District Clerk shall serve a true copy of these findings, conclusions, and recommendation on the parties. Pursuant to Title 28, United States Code, Section 636(b)(1), any party who desires to object to these findings, conclusions, and recommendation must serve and file written objections within fourteen days after being served with a copy. A party filing objections must specifically identify those findings, conclusions, or recommendation to which objections are being made. The District Court need not consider frivolous, conclusory, or general objections. A party's failure to file such written objections to these proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation shall bar that party from a *de novo* determination by the District Court. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Additionally, any failure to file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation within fourteen days after being served with a copy shall bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the Magistrate Judge that are accepted by the District Court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Services Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).